

REMARKS

Claims 20-23 and 32-39 are pending in the application, with claims 20 and 32 being the independent claims. Independent claims 20 and 32 are sought to be amended. Entry and consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. No new matter is believed to have been introduced by this amendment.

Applicant has made the above Amendment to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding objections and rejections.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 20, 22, 32 and 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,208,637 (hereinafter referred to as "Eames") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,346,964 (hereinafter referred to as "Rogers"). Claims 21 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Eames in view of Rogers and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,347,075 (hereinafter referred to as "Barzegar"). Claims 23 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Eames in view of Rogers and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,061,450 (hereinafter referred to as Bauer"). Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Eames in view of Rogers and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,118,768 (hereinafter referred to as "Bhatia"). Applicant respectfully traverses these

rejections since Eames, Rogers, Barzegar, Bauer and Bhatia, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each element of amended independent claims 20 and 32 for at least the following reason.

Independent claims 20 and 32 have been amended to include an expansion port to include a signal to carry information not associated with the one or more telephone numbers that are to be serviced by the broadband telephony adapter to a second broadband telephony adapter. Eames, Rogers, Barzegar, Bauer and/or Bhatia, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed expansion port. Therefore, for at least this reason, independent claims 20 and 32 (and their dependent claims 21-23 and 33-39) are patentable over Eames, Rogers, Barzegar, Bauer and Bhatia, either taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

INVITATION FOR A TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned, Molly A. McCall, at (703) 633-3311 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action. Thus, Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, and allowance of this application.


Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Dated: July 18, 2005

/Molly A. McCall/Reg. No. 46,126
Molly A. McCall
(703) 633-3311

P7612 Reply to Final OA

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:	
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	
On: <u>July 18, 2005</u>	
Signature: 	
	Katherine Jennings